DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 638 SP 034 892

AUTHOR Eidle, William R.
TITLE Values Education, the Judgment of Value and Self-Esteem.
PUB DATE [Oct 93]
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Processes; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Learning Activities; Metacognition; Self Actualization; *Self Concept; *Self Esteem; Teaching Methods; *Value Judgment; *Values Education
IDENTIFIERS *Generalized Empirical Method

ABSTRACT

If individuals have an objectified, firm understanding of themselves as subjects who exist within a basic self-constituting process for knowing and valuing, they will discover that their authenticity as human beings exists in fulfilling the requirements through which this self-constituting process effectively expresses itself. Self-appropriation of the generalized empirical method (GEM), which is a sequence of patterned interrelated cognitive operations through which individuals are constituted as knowers, valuers, and subsequent decision-makers and doers consistent with one's knowledge and values, can provide a foundational grounding for understanding the valuing process, its relationship to self-esteem, and its potential for influencing the development of values education programs. The four levels of the GEM involve attention to data, seeking understanding of the data, determining the truth of reality, and being rationally self-conscious and responsible in determining values and value-oriented courses of action. The role of education is to assist the learner in making value-oriented judgments and to provide age-appropriate assistance for the learner in recognizing that self-esteem is to be found in understanding the self-transcending mandates of GEM and the personal authenticity gained through ongoing commitment to their fulfillment. Specific learning activities are listed, and model programs are noted. (Contains 17 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 638

VALUES EDUCATION,

THE JUDGMENT OF VALUE AND SELF-ESTEEM

William R. Eidle, Ph.D.

Social and Behavioral Sciences
Marist College
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Eidle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP034892

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Values Education and Self-Esteem

Introduction

Much is spoken today about a decline in the values orientation of our society and the consequent need to marshall resources for the encouragement of values development by strengthening the family unit, all levels of the academic curriculum, and professional codes of ethics. A concurrent and seemingly related lament is that our children do not have an adequate sense of their own self-esteem. Hence the national rush to provide school programming for the encouragement of self-esteem. This situation is indeed unsettling. It is all the more compelling since we live in a society where sensitivity to issues of self-development and self-fulfillment is unprecedented. The paradox is that the self-development movement has unwittingly contributed to the creation of "Me" centered environments which have led to more and more self-alienation. It seems reasonable that a significant portion of the dilemma may be attributed to the possibility that people in their individual understanding of themselves are insufficiently aware that in their foundational structure as human beings they have been constituted with the capacity to be authentic knowers of reality and value with the concomitant capacity to be authentic decision makers and doers consistent with their knowledge and value. Nor do people seem to have a sufficient awareness that it is they themselves who have it within their power to create a values regulated world through

their personal ongoing commitment to the fulfillment of these self-constituting capacities. It further seems reasonable that it is in the recognition of these self-constituting capacities and responsible attention to their fulfillment that we may reveal to ourselves the foundational basis and criterion for making positive judgments with regard to our own self-esteem.

Stated more succinctly my premise is that if individuals have an objectified firm understanding of themselves as subjects who exist within a basic self-constituting process for knowing and valuing, they will discover that their authenticity as human beings exists in fulfilling the requirements through which this self-constituting process effectively expresses itself. My further premise is that in committing themselves responsibly to the fulfillment of these uniquely human capacities, people are being humanly authentic and therein experience the fundamental data which demands a personalized judgment of positive self-esteem.

There would appear to be a common sense wisdom in this formulation. But what evidence exists in its support? One might infer that at least implicitly this formulation has guided the development and behavior of good men and women down through the ages. Yet we live in times that doubt and taunt the wisdom of the past. We demand "scientific proof". We demand to know that our formulations are really accurate and not just subject to the conventions and biases of the times soon due for revision as we experience change in the social, moral and political climates of

the day. And so the question arises: Is there reasonable support for the formulation I have proposed? Can it be objectified in terms of the naturally occurring constitutional structure of the human organism?

Generalized Empirical Method

I believe the answer is in the affirmative. The esteemed 20th century philosopher/theologian, Bernard Lonergan, S.J. (1958, 1972), has provided us with the means for incredible insight into the existence of our self-constituting knowing and valuing processes and their implications for effective human living. He has done so through his explication on generalized empirical method (GEM) and its self-appropriation. GEM is the label Lonergan gave to the sequence of patterned interrelated cognitive operations through which we are constituted as knowers, valuers, and subsequent decision-makers and doers consistent with our knowledge and values. Self-appropriation refers to the process of discovering and objectifying GEM for ourselves as we bring our attention to bear on the cognitive functioning of our own consciousness. Lonergan wrote of these issues as a philosopher/theologian with an approach that was of primary interest in advancing knowledge in those disciplines. As a psychologist I have attempted to draw upon Lonergan's seminal work and indicate its relevance for psychology as a science. I did this in my book The Self-Appropriation of Interiority: A Foundation for Psychology (1990) and I continue to do so in the courses I teach at Marist College: The Development of

Consciousness; Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Esteem; and Educating Towards the Acquisition of Values. Each of these enterprises is grounded in the self-appropriation of GEM as elaborated by Lonergan but goes further in attempting to demonstrate the relevance of GEM as a foundation from which we can derive the germinal source for formulating our understanding of basic psychological constructs such as self-esteem and intrinsic motivation; and how further this foundation has implications for preparing our students young and old in the development of their consciousness and in the development of the processes they use in determining values. To engage in learning about and practicing the procedures for self-appropriating GEM is a difficult and time consuming task (Lonergan, 1972, Chap. 1; Eidle, 1990, Chaps. 2-3); one with which my undergraduate and graduate students continue to struggle. But if awarenesses gained from the self-appropriation of GEM are as significant for human development and living as I suggest, we must find ways of simplifying (tho not trivializing) the self-appropriation process so as to make its significance apparent to a far wider audience of parents, educators, and of course our youth. This is the long-range task I have charted for myself. However, for the purposes of this paper I would like to focus on the relevance of self-appropriated GEM as a foundational grounding for understanding the valuing process, its relationship to self-esteem, and its potential for having influence on the development of values education programs. This effort will necessitate a

brief digression while I attempt to explain a little more precisely what is meant by GEM before elaborating on its relevance to a foundational understanding of self-esteem.

Bernard Lonergan began his journey into the self-appropriation of GEM with a question: What am I doing when I am knowing? It is a question of cognitive theory. In highly truncated form his resultant answer was:

> Firstly, I experience data;
>
> Secondly, I seek to understand what that data means, i.e. to have an insight into the intelligibility within the data;
>
> Thirdly, I seek to verify the correctness of my understandings by seeking out possible alternative understandings, marshall and weigh the evidence and ultimately make a judgment that my understanding is correct or it is not correct; that it is probably correct or it is probably not correct; or that I cannot make a judgment because I do not have sufficient evidence.
>
> Fourthly, after I have rationally affirmed reality either in its already concrete existence or in its potential creation through a rationally affirmed plan of action, I am left to ask about the relevance of this knowledge for my living. Of what value is it in terms of what I ought to do? Once I have determined that what I have come to know provides the basis for a worthwhile choice or course of action, I must make a decision as to whether to commit myself to the choice or action and to consistent follow through in doing.

GEM is thus constituted by a patterned sequence of operations: experiencing, understanding, making rational judgments in the affirmation of reality and making well deliberated judgments of value which guide consistent follow through in decisions, choices, and behavior. Independent of our advertence to GEM, its pattern of cognitive operations occurs within us spontaneously

every time we seek to know and value anything. The fact that GEM's pattern of operations is recurrent in the production of knowledge and values led Lonergan to identify it as a method. The method is empirical in that it is grounded in experience. It is generalized in two ways: firstly, GEM treats not only the data of sense, (i.e. data made available to us through the functioning of the sensory nervous system) but also the data of consciousness, (i.e. the awareness of the cognitive operations themselves as they are experienced in act); secondly, GEM undergirds not only all of our everyday common sense knowing but also all of the specialized methods for knowing which have been formulated and prescribed to advance theoretical inquiry in the various academic disciplines.

Lonergan suggests that in the process of self-appropriating GEM (i.e. objectifying GEM), one will concomitantly discover and objectify the fact that its operations emanate from an operator, oneself, the subject. That is, the self-appropriation of GEM provides the occasion for unearthing the fact that prior to our attempt at objectifying ourselves as the operators in the patterned operations of generalized empirical method we were already given as the operators of those operations. Our attempt at the objectification of this phenomenon is simply to formally reveal to ourselves that we are so constituted and in exactly what that constitution consists. Once individuals have successfully participated in the self-appropriation process, they will have affirmed for themselves that they are constituted with

the capacities to know and value through the patterned operations of GEM and that with this knowledge and value, they have the responsibility to participate effectively in the ongoing creation of both themselves and their world.

The motor or force which drives the subject through the operations of GEM has been labeled the pure, indeterminate, unrestricted, comprehensive, detached, disinterested, desire to know. It is a spontaneously occurring self-constituting dynamic thrust which manifests itself in the different modes of determinate questions which occur at each level of GEM: attention to the data to be questioned at level one; questions for clarification at level two; questions for verification at level three; questions in the determination of value and appropriate decision at level four. It is called the pure question in that it is the prior unformulated urge which anticipates that there is much to be known that is not known yet; and it serves as the grounding force for the formulation of determinate questions about specific issues.

GEM is verified through its self-appropriation. Lonergan argues (1972, pp. 16-20) that everyday experience of the operations of GEM belie the possibility of their denial. He suggests that the pattern of the operations is given in our experience of the unity of our consciousness, an experience through which we become aware that the operations do not occur in isolation, but rather are interrelated in the pattern identified as GEM. Lonergan goes on to elaborate that any revision of GEM

cannot revise "the normative pattern immanent in our conscious and intentional operations" (pp. 18-19) but only the " . . . objectifications of that pattern in concepts, propositions, words." (p. 19) Yet even here " . . . there is a sense in which the objectification of the normative pattern of our conscious and intentional operations does not admit revision. The sense in question is that the activity of revising consists in such operations in accord with such a pattern, so that a revision rejecting the pattern would be rejecting itself" (p. 19). This is so because in making such an attempt at revision one would first have to attend to the data upon which one is relying to make the case for a revision; secondly one would be using the operations of the second level of GEM to provide for a better understanding of the data; thirdly, after critical reflection one would declare the greater probability of the revised interpretations thereby revealing the use of rational operations on the third level of GEM; and finally by going through the labor of attempting to revise GEM one would be expressing the value dimension of level four GEM with its concomitant mandate for responsible behavior by positing the basis for the revision to be the moral responsibility to advance a more accurate interpretation of the knowing and valuing process.

Accepting as one might be in identifying oneself with this formulation of GEM and its dynamic thrust toward truth and value, it soon becomes apparent that fulfillment of GEM at its various levels is no small task. For one must be attentive to data at level one, intelligent in seeking understanding at level two, rationally open to determining the truth of reality at level three and rationally self-conscious and responsible in determining values and value oriented courses of action at level four. The history of humankind and our own personal moral histories reveal that when it suits our purpose we have little difficulty fulfilling the mandates of GEM. Yet when it does not, when fears, bias, opposing desires and personal psychological defenses contravene, the naturally occurring spontaneous thrusts of GEM may become thwarted. GEM is oriented beyond itself to the whole world of being: reality as it is or as it can reasonably hope to be created through the rational plans and actions of rational people. It is oriented beyond the fears and biases of self-centeredness. Supression of the spontaneous free-flowing inquiry of the desire to know by bias fuels what Lonergan has called "the flight from knowing", a process which serves to promote self-centered interests.

The success of GEM's operations demand that the operator be mindful of his/her fears and biases, allow for the possibility that his/her judgments have been so contaminated, and work towards their elimination. Lonergan uses the term self-

transcendence to describe the natural being-oriented thrust of GEM; a thrust that is genuinely and sincerely open to asking the further question. That is, the individual as constituted by GEM has the capacity to be self-transcending by being open to further questions in fulfilling GEM's mandates to be attentive, intelligent, critically reflective, and responsible while living consistently in accord with the ensuing answers and decisions. Indeed, self-transcendence in the sense described is the major criterion for the effective fulfillment of GEM. Yet having the capacity and working towards its fulfillment are two very different issues. Herein lies the basis for the root notion of human authenticity. GEM is a uniquely human capacity. If it is being fulfilled appropriately it is functioning authentically--i.e., as it was designed to function. But GEM is operated by an operator, the human subject. So it is the human subject who is being authentic in providing for the effective fulfillment of the self-transcending function of GEM; and it is the human subject who is being unauthentic in thwarting its effective function.

It would appear that if individuals have self-appropriated GEM, thereby objectively recognizing themselves in their self-transcending capacities to know and value, they experience for themselves that their own fulfillment as human beings lies in the authentic fulfillment of GEM's mandates. The authentic person commits him/herself to such fulfillment. This does not mean that he/she always succeeds: rather, that a commitment has been made which serves as a guiding undertow, an attitude, that leads one

towards authentic knowing, valuing, and living; a commitment which serves as the authentic undertow in guiding the ongoing creation of the self.

The Judgment of Value in The Context of GEM

It will be noted that the first three levels of GEM are cognitive in nature leading one to seek out, understand, and affirm reality as it is or as it can reasonably hope to be in accordance with a rational plan of action. The fourth level is the moral or value oriented level. It builds from and is inclusive of the previous cognitive levels but it approaches this already affirmed reality in a fundamentally different way. For now the questions to be asked are not only to be rationally posed by a rational person, they are to be posed by a person who is also at once "rationally self conscious" (Lonergan 1957, pp. 599, 613); that is, a person who not only seeks to know reality but who also seeks to know the value of reality--the worthwhileness of reality--in the context of his/her living. And so the value question is really the question about the good "as the possible object of rational choice" (Lonergan 1958, p. 601). Values are what are being sought at level four in response to questions for deliberation over what is worthwhile; whereas the factualness of reality is what is being sought though the aggregate of questioning and critical reflection of levels one through three (Lonergan, 1972, p. 34). It is important here to emphasize the connection at level four of the person being "rationally self-conscious" as he/she seeks the "possible objects of rational

choice" in determining what is worthwhile (i.e. what is of value) for his/her living. The choice is not one motivated merely by preference based on one's feeling state of the moment or the agreeable/disagreeable nature of the content being deliberated. It may well include these but preeminently it includes the rational dimension of the self as a rational being capable of rationally determining value and directing this value into value-guided choices and decisions which in turn are reflected in value-guided behavior. In stressing the rational dimension of the value judgment it should be emphasized that the judgment of value is not merely a cognitive event. Rather as Lonergan (1972, p. 38) describes, it is a tri-partite happening in which the affective (feeling) dimension spontaneously emerges in response to what has been rationally affirmed at level three and must also be considered in the context of rational deliberation over value at level four. For it is apparent that a feeling response to the rational is of itself an affective form of evaluation. Ultimately the value judgment rationally coordinates the affective and rational into the uniqueness of itself. It is this unique unity of the rational and the affective that not only expresses the rationality of the value judgment but which at once also provides the dynamic affective empowering agency for moving the person to choices, decisions and behavior consistent with the value judgment.

Richard Morrill (1980) in his book Teaching Values in College provides some important insights that complement

Lonergan's explication on the level four valuing process, particularly as this necessitates an expression of moral self-transcendence. Firstly, Morrill defines values as "standards and patterns of choice that guide persons and groups toward satisfaction, fulfillment and meaning" (p. 62). He continues, "A purported value that fails to press its claim in relevant action of some kind actually is something else, perhaps a belief, an attitude, a feeling, or an ideal" (pp. 63-64).

Secondly, Morrill, in the context of values criticism, describes eight criteria to be examined in making a value judgment. Morrill suggests that these criteria are "tacit in the sense that they are given implicitly in ordinary experience and they are reflected in ordinary language" (p. 93). They may be considered as factors that extend the focus of inquiry about values beyond any narrow minded stance and force consideration of ever widening issues of logic and relevancy. The eight criteria are as follows:

- Consistency: is the value consistent with one's behavior? Is it consistent with other values in one's constellation of values? Would it be appropriate if everyone held this value and acted accordingly?

- Reciprocity: how would you like it if you were treated according to this value? Reciprocity includes "both the rational test of consistency and the prerequisite of respect for self and others" (p. 94). It is popularly expressed in the Golden Rule.

- Coherence: does the value fit together in one's constellation of values and values priorities or does it fail to meet this test of coherence?

- Comprehensiveness: is this value in such a narrow self-contained value system that it precludes understanding and dialogue with other broader social units, e.g. the family, neighborhood, etc.?

- Adequacy: does this value "reflect the presupposition of all valuing--the basic respect of self and others" (p. 95)?

- Duration: can the value endure the test of time or is it just of transient significance?

- Authenticity: does the value truly reflect one's belief and judgment or is it merely an acquiescence to conformity?

- Openness: is one still open to hearing another point of view and seriously considering it? Is one willing to allow the further question?

Examination of value issues in light of these eight criteria help mitigate against the possibility of premature closure in making value judgments or an unwillingness to reopen and reexamine the situation should new considerations emerge. As Lonergan posits self-transcendence to be the criterion for faithfully fulfilling the mandates of GEM, so adherence to Morrill's eight criteria for values criticism helps assure the achievement of human authenticity through self-transcendence.

Self-Esteem

It is not a huge leap to move from the issue of self-authenticity to that of self-esteem. Esteem is a term denoting positive evaluation. Self-esteem denotes positive valuing of oneself. In those self-reflexive instances when the processes of GEM are focused upon oneself in terms of understanding, affirming, and evaluating one's effectiveness as a human being,

how could one not make a judgment of esteem about oneself if there is first objective recognition that one is identified with GEM and that one has then made an ongoing commitment to its authentic fulfillment? And so it is suggested that GEM, the very process that constitutes people as human by orienting them to seek and affirm authentic reality and value, thereby simultaneously provides them with the basis for human authenticity and the opportunity for a personal judgment about their own self-esteem. An issue that emerges in this context is that of the criterion for self-esteem. Therefore, following the evidence revealed through the self-appropriation of GEM, it is further suggested that the appropriate criterion for a positive judgment on self-value is to be found in one's commitment to authenticity through self-transcendence in fulfilling the mandates of GEM: be attentive, be understanding, be critically reflective, and be responsible.

Individually it would appear that people tend to adopt varying criteria for self-esteem depending upon the different learning experiences and traditions to which they have been exposed. For example, one person may define self-esteem in terms of possessions; another in the reception of constant feedback of praise and adulation; and yet another in terms of competence in a specific field of endeavor. Whatever, the criterion one uses, it risks being an inappropriate and self-defeating criterion if it is not linked to authentic fulfillment of one's naturally occurring constitutional capacity for uniquely human functioning

in the development and regulation of oneself and one's world. The selection of an inappropriate criterion is self-defeating in that the likelihood of its fulfillment may be so impossible or transitory that one could not reasonably hope to maintain self-esteem during the "down" times. Thus, following our above example: when one's bank account is depleted so likewise the self-esteem; when for whatever reason the praise is not there, neither is the self-esteem; or if competence in a particular area of endeavor is deficient so is self-esteem.

It is reasonable then that one inquire about the mainstream of psychological thought on self-esteem and my premise that self-esteem is intimately associated with one's personal commitment to self-transcendence in the effective functioning of GEM. In her review of the psychological literature on self-esteem Susan Harter (1983) reports a diversity of opinion. Most notably the literature distinguishes between global self-esteem and the differentiated component elements of self esteem. Among these latter a consensus is developing that they include four dimensions: general competence, moral worth/self-approval, power/control, and acceptance/love-worthiness. It is further suggested that these differentiated elements within self-esteem have influence in determining the overall character of global self-esteem. It would appear that the four differentiated dimensions interact in a highly integrative way in producing the global self-esteem gestalt. The exact configuration of these interactions requires further study. What is clear to me however

is that there is an obvious compatability between the dimensions of self-esteem summarized by Harter and my attempt to link self-esteem with personal authenticity in one's recognition and commitment to the ongoing fulfillment of GEM. There is clearly a competence factor in successfully fulfilling the mandates of GEM, and this in any situation upon which these mandates are brought to bear. There is also a power/control factor in that GEM's activity provides for the liberation of oneself as self-creator and participant in the creation of one's own world. Similarly the link of the moral worth/self-approval factor to the valuing dimension of GEM is striking. The literature suggests that self-esteem requires one to be moral. GEM provides the foundational self-constituting process through which one expresses moral judgment and behavior.

What of the acceptance/love-worthiness dimension? To know anything at all including oneself one must participate effectively in the self-transcending activity of GEM. Interestingly, to be self-transcending about oneself is to recognize and value oneself in one's acts of self-transcendence both cognitive and behavioral. One recognizes oneself in these acts of self-transcendence when one experiences oneself being open and admiringly attentive to another and when one experiences oneself acting benevolently to further the best interest of the other. But such attentiveness and benevolence are none other than expressions of respect and love for the other; expressions from a person in the dynamic state of being in love (Dunne,

1983). The state is dynamic because it is associated with the dynamism of GEM through which it operates. Phrased differently, the dynamism of GEM with which the person is constitutionally identified becomes a transformed dynamism when it is the dynamism of a person in love. This transformation of the dynamism will have an empowering influence on the effectiveness of the ensuing operations of GEM because in this dynamic state one is more open, less defensive, more self-giving and more vulnerable. It should be emphasized that a person who is in this dynamic state of love may not know it. For to know that one is in love requires affirmation of that fact through an act of rational judgment. One can be in the dynamic state of love and perform acts of love before one has acknowledged this state of love to oneself. It follows that when one comes to understand and acknowledge that one is capable of love and that one's love can only be expressed through the operations of GEM, a rational basis is provided for making a judgment as to whether or not one loves oneself. But now a further question arises: What is the value of loving oneself particularly as such love of self pertains to self-esteem? It would seem that the answer to this question requires an affirmative response to three correlative propositions which together form a context for understanding the value of loving oneself. These are as follows: love is the most fundamental and empowering principle imaginable for the encouragement of truth, creativity, and good; love if it exists at all can only be mediated by persons; to be a person who mediates love is to

respond to a calling of which there is none higher. It then follows that if generally speaking one recognizes oneself as being a lover, and one also acknowledges that to be a lover is of the highest value for being human, then one has met the conditions for affirming and accepting oneself--for loving oneself. And if one accepts and loves oneself, one has fulfilled the acceptance/love-worthiness dimension of self-esteem. With such self-acceptance goes the continuous responsibility of committing and recommitting oneself to the process of self-transcendence. For what is really valued in a judgment of self-love is oneself as having the potential and occasional successes in actually mediating love for others.

Missing from the above discourse on the rational elements of self-love is the most obvious element--the feeling of love for oneself. Without the affective component of love there is no love since it is the affective component which differentiates a mere rational judgment about one's loving from the effective fullness of one's experience of love. Interestingly, the affective component is itself evaluative. It tells you that you have strong positive feelings for the other. These feelings arise spontaneously but of themselves are not rational. However when they are integrated with the elements to which the rational components of love refer, they together constitute the state of love which can subsequently be articulated in rational terms. Therefore to be an effective fulfillment of the acceptnace/love-worthiness dimension of self-esteem one's self-love must be a

full-bodied affective experience of love.

A very important derivative of this explication on GEM and its association with self-esteem has to do with the question of God and God's love/esteem for each person. For GEM must ultimately give rise to the question: "Does there or does there not exist a necessary transcendent, intelligent ground of the universe? Is that ground or are we the primary instances of moral consciousness?" (Lonergan 1972, p. 342). If one affirms that there is an intelligent, moral ground for the universe, then it is clear that its ground, i.e. God, has created each person with his/her dynamic capacity to know and to value and to love; and in the act of this creation has expressed His love/esteem for each person. Thus the person who acknowledges God's self-transcending intervention into the universe finds him/herself loved/esteemed by God; a valuing which enlarges the basis for one's own self-esteem by giving it a foundation in the self-transcendence of God. Religious leaders are often suspicious of the term self-esteem as one which connotes arrogance and conceit. Placed in the context of self-transcendence as mandated by GEM, the emphasis is shifted from any possible pompous self-adulation to one of humble, self-transcending concern for truth, value, and the other. This thrust would therefore seem to be in harmony and supportive of the orientations for human development espoused by the world's major religions.

The reality of GEM, and ourselves as the inate constitutionally designed operators of GEM provides a very

powerful objectified base for linking people's capacity for value oriented decision-making and self-esteem. It is a basis that I believe each of us, whether as parents, educators, professional ethicists or concerned citizens, have the obligation to explore more fully. Yet we must also be quick to admit that long before Lonergan provided us with the procedures for objectifying our own interiority people of good will were behaving honorably and were fostering the development of values in their children. Lonergan (1985) very forcefully orients us to this fact when he draws attention to the distinction between development from below-up and development from above-down, a distinction that his close friend and colleague Fred Crowe (1985) later describes as the way of achievement vs the way of heritage or tradition. Development from below-up, the way of achievement, is the way of GEM beginning with experience and moving through the levels of understanding, rationality and value (EURV). Development from above-down, the way of heritage or tradition, is described in reverse order of the operations of GEM, i.e. VRUE. In this instance one is first given one's values and the knowledge that undergirds them. One accepts them because they appear to come from reliable and valued sources, e.g. one's parents, teachers, etc.; and they are typically accepted before one has had the age-related cognitive development, the appropriate experiential/educational background, or the occasion to determine values vis-a-vis the way of achievement. Nonetheless as people move through the various human developmental stages their

reliance on the way of achievement is enhanced while their retention of the way of heritage is diminished albeit not completely.

Self-Esteem and Acceptance by Others

In esteeming oneself it would appear that one is also concurrently being accepting of oneself in counter distinction to self-rejection. However, in addition to the need for self-esteem (inclusive of self-acceptance), humans also experience a need for acceptance by others and a need to belong (e.g. Maslow 1970, pp. 43-46). Too often in popular thinking and programming the need for self-esteem and the need for belongingness including acceptance by others have been confused and intertwined. Popular wisdom has frequently appeared to define self-esteem at least partially in terms of acceptance by others. This would of course mean that without acceptance by others or without that need for belongingness fulfilled, one could not esteem oneself well. In contrast my proposal, which grounds self-esteem in the criterion of an ongoing commitment to authenticity through self-transcendence in fulfilling the mandates of GEM, does not rely on acceptance by others as essential to a determination of self-esteem. The confusion between self-esteem and acceptance by others may arise from the fact that positive accepting statements from others may well serve to initiate or reinforce one's own positive thoughts about oneself. From my perspective such initiation or reinforcement can be helpful if it focuses the individual's attention on the criterion of authenticity through

self-transcendence. Inclusion of input from others as focused on the person's fulfillment of the mandates of GEM would reveal the person to be open in self-transcendence to relevant feedback data from others which in turn would be facilitative in helping the person make a positive judgment of self-esteem about him/herself. Indeed, under ordinary circumstances having such feedback available from reliable external sources can be considered a significant, tho not essential aspect of the process for making the self-esteem judgment. Yet, there are obviously other circumstances wherein through ignorance or neglect on the part of relevant external sources (e.g. parents, teachers, supervisors) appropriate feedback is not forthcoming. In these instances it may be more difficult for individuals to come to a judgment of self-esteem but theoretically not impossible. As they understand and accept the proposed criterion for self-esteem and in self-transcendence honestly seek it's fulfillment they can become sufficiently knowledgeable so as to esteem themselves well even in the face of silence, inappropriate criticsm or lack of support from significant others. Yet while I suggest the theoretical possibility for developing a positive sense of self-esteem in the absence of support from relevant others, it should also be evident that fulfillment of the grounding conditions for self-esteem, (awareness and internalization of the self-transcending criteria for self-esteem) necessitates that a person be educated about these criteria. Directly or indirectly such education will reflect concern, care and support for the person by the educator

and provide at least a minimal basis from which the person could internalize a sense of being accepted by a positively regarded other. In practice then, while it is important to keep clear the conceptual and functional distinction between self-esteem and acceptance by relevant others, it is equally important to be mindful that internalized substantively credible support from a relevant other is a significant facilitating condition that will greatly encourage a person's judgment about his/her self-esteem. It therefore follows that educational programming for the development of self-esteem be inclusive of this valuable conditioning factor.

Educational Programs

Keeping in mind this sketchy explication on GEM and its association with self-esteem, I now invite my readers to return to my opening wonderment as to how we can facilitate strengthening society's moral fiber and vitality. But now in the context of the foregoing discourse we can ask more pointedly: how might we construct educational practices, exercises and programs so as to facilitate the development of people's value oriented decision-making and their awareness that foundationally self-esteem is criterion referenced to value-oriented decision-making in the context of GEM? As we approach this task I think it is especially important that we work from a position where minimally we have begun to engage the self-appropriation process ourselves. Self-appropriation of GEM can provide a compass for our exploration into the values/self-esteem quagmire. Perhaps

some of our educational recommendations may not appear that different from those already in place, tried and true. But now we will understand them and be enabled to elaborate and enlarge upon them in the rootedness of the validation and verification which self-appropriated GEM provides.

In his book Old Things and New: A Strategy for Education, Crowe (1985) has provided us with a very practical set of recommendations for values-based education as related to the distinctions and integrations of the way of achievement and the way of heritage. Herein Crowe suggests age-related cognitive exercises associated with giving the student practice in strengthening his/her capacity to perform the cognitive operations associated with each of the different levels of GEM. Yet ultimately the task is not merely to strengthen the operations per se but also to have the student reflect upon him/herself as the operator; the person who has the capacities for manifesting the operations; and who in this manifestation can better come to know his/her foundational value-oriented self.

Thus from a values-education perspective our objective is two-fold: to assist the learner in the process of making value-oriented judgments; and to provide age appropriate assistance for the learner in recognizing that the criterion for self-esteem is to be found in an understanding of the self-transcending mandates of GEM and the personal authenticity gained through ongoing commitment to their fulfillment. In practice this means that teachers who are consciously seeking to engage their students in

values-education activities must be attentive not only to educating their students in the processes for values-acquisition but concurrently must help these students understand that their involvement in the self-transcending operations of GEM provides a reasonable and personally satisfying criterion for self-esteem. That is, values educators must facilitate a student's personal internalized discovery that one would want to be a values-oriented and values-guided person because through such activity one can feel good about oneself, respect oneself, and esteem oneself well. When a student is encouraged in his/her attempts at fulfilling the mandates of GEM and is provided with an opportunity to critically reflect upon his/her human authenticity through such functioning, there is a heightened likelihood of the student experiencing positive feelings of self-esteem. As the frequency of such positively experienced occurrences increase, so too the probability that the student will seek to develop habitual modes of authentic value-guided decision making, choices, and behavior even in those instances where values are confronted by competing non-value oriented preferences and non-value oriented feeling states or urges. Failure of behavior to be value-guided does not necessarily obliterate self-esteem; it merely reflects the difficulty humans experience in remaining faithful to the self-transcending mandates of GEM. Recognized and accepted failure has the potential for providing the student with constructive feedback so as to reaffirm the student in his/her goal to be value-directed. Indirectly such recommitment

tacitly serves to reaffirm the criterion of self-esteem; whereas, it is the individual's existing self-esteem that permits him/her the courage to recognize and accept the fact of his/her failure in the first place.

The methods and procedures for providing a value-oriented education are most likely many and varied. However, synthesizing them into comprehensive programs systematized around the operations of GEM is a major challenge to our ingenuity and awaits further elaboration and publication. For now I will be content to merely list some of the activities my students and I have derived from the literature that might be useful for inclusion in a broader scoped values education program. These include:

- sensitizing students to the dynamism of the desire to know within themselves as it has been transformed to a dynamism for deliberating on value
- sensitizing students to the ubiquitous role of values in their living
- sensitizing students to the link between values, action, and personal integrity (authenticity; self-esteem)
- sensitizing students to the way of ERUV and VRUE
- provision of exercises associated with the different levels of ERUV and VRUE following the direction of Crowe (1985)
- provision of exercises wherein students become aware of the values they hold based on VRUE as distinct from the values they hold based on EURV.

- provision of a values-education context/climate that assists students in critically reflecting upon the integral relationships among self-esteem, the formation of values and the production of value-guided behavior.

- provision of exercises as reviewed by Richard Morrill (1980) in his book Teaching Values in College

    - values consciousness or awareness exercises (i.e. identification of exactly what one's values are)

    - values inquiry or analysis exercises (i.e. examine situations and identify the values issues therein)

    - values criticism exercises (i.e. to use the eight criteria identified by Morrill [1980] in critiquing one's values: consistency, reciprocity, coherence, comprehensiveness, adequacy, duration, authenticity, and openness. The use of these criteria can be particularly helpful in assisting the student to guard against premature closure on a values issue by prodding the asking of further relevant questions.)

I would not want to create the impression that values-education programs do not exist. Fortunately they do. As an example, the New York State Education Department sponsored an annual national conference on values education from 1987 to 1990. Among some of the more institutionalized values-education programs represented at the conferences are those of Maryland's Baltimore County School System and the Sweet Home School District of Amherst and Tonawanda, N.Y. Proponents of these programs report impressive successes. They are particularly helpful in

stressing the socio-political need to involve the community in the development of values education programs. The Maryland Student Service Alliance Program under the direction of Kathleen Townsend and Margaret O'Neill is particularly helpful in stressing the potential of volunteer service in fostering values development.

It is important and relevant to make special reference to the work on the interrelationship between self-esteem and social problems initiated by the State of California. In 1986 California appointed the California Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility. The work of this task force resulted in the publication of The Social Imporance of Self-Esteem (Mecca, Smelser and Vasconcellos, Eds., 1989) and the Task Force's final report Toward A State of Self-Esteem (1990, Calif. State Dept. of Education). Although the primary emphasis of the Task Force was the promotion of self-esteem as a force to ameliorate social problems, the integral relationship between self-esteem and value-oriented living is assumed throughout these documents. Indeed for their purposes the California Task Force defined self-esteem as "Appreciating my own worth and importance and having the character to be accountable for myself and to act responsibly toward others" (1990, p. 18). This definition is compatible with the presentation made throughout this paper. However, it is based on intuitive wisdom and clinical evidence as gleaned from the sources studied by the Task Force: "We have a fairly firm grasp of what is meant by self-esteem, as revealed by

our own introspection and observation of the behavior of others. But it is hard to put that understanding into precise words" (Mecca, et. al., 1989). What the Task Force's definition does not contain is the evidence for the self-constituted grounding of the self-esteem/values-oriented living relationship as revealed through the self-appropriation of GEM. Rather, it would appear that the self-appropriation of GEM complements the well founded intuitions of the Task Force by rooting them in adherence to GEM's self-constituting mandates: be attentive; be understanding; be critically reflective; be responsible.

Surely all of these above mentioned programs and those like them throughout the nation deserve our applause and gratitude. Many of them may include activities akin to the type recommended earlier but most likely not in the context of GEM or the systematized synthesis that GEM affords. Therefore I would recommend that we as educators now concentrate our efforts on coming to know and articulate the foundational self-constituting link between GEM and self-esteem. With the security of that foundational groundedness we can draw upon GEM in formulating and developing values-education practices, exercises, and programs. Further elaborations on the precise procedures for self-appropriating GEM are beyond the scope of this article. However they are necessary for the self-appropriation process and as mentioned earlier may be found in writings such as Lonergan (1972 Chap. 1) and Eidle (1990 Chaps. 2 & 3). It is only in the self-appropriation of GEM that we will gain the personal firsthand

knowledge that commitment to the authentic functioning of GEM provides a foundational constitutionally based criterion for self-esteem. The fact that authentic execution of the knowing/valuing process is so intimately linked to the criterion for self-esteem should not appear novel; yet somehow it may sound astonishing to a world that wants to encourage self-esteem but where value issues are treated with much hesitancy and sometimes even with disdain. The charge belongs to all of us who are concerned about encouraging values-oriented decision-making at all levels of our society and who are interested in strengthening the self-esteem of our citizenry. Crowe (1985) has led the way in illustrating ways to associate values-education with GEM. Others throughout the land are struggling to institutionalize values-education programs and programs for fostering the development of self-esteem. Ours can be to build upon their efforts in the synthesis of systematized programs grounded on the link between the self-constituting operations of GEM and the derived criterion knowledge they reveal for the advancement of self-esteem.

References

Baltimore County Public Schools (1988) **1984 and Beyond, A Reaffirmation of Values: A Report of the Task Force on Values Education and Ethical Behavior of the Baltimore County Public Schools.** Towson, Md.: Baltimore Co. Public Schools.

California State Department of Education (1990) **Toward a State of Esteem: The Final Report of the California Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem and Personal Responsibility.** Calif.: Bureau of Publications, Calif. State Dept. of Ed.

Crowe, F. E. (1985) **Old Things and New: A Strategy for Education.** Supplementary Issue of Lonergan Workshop, Vol. 5. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Dunne, T. (1983). **Faith, Charity & Hope: The Theological Virtues in Method in Theology.** Paper delivered at the Lonergan Workshop, Boston College.

Eidle, W. R. (1990) **The Self-Appropriation of Interiority: A Foundation for Psychology.** N.Y.: Peter Lang Publishers, Inc.

Eidle, W. R. (1993) **Values Education and Self-Esteem.** Education, 112 (4), 661-671.

Harter, S. (1983) Developmental perspectives on the self-system. In P. H. Mussen & E.M. Hetherington (Eds.), **Handbook of child psychology** (Vol. 4). N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons.

Lonergan, B. J. (1958) **Insight.** San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Lonergan, B. J. (1972) **Method in Theology.** New York: Seabury Press.

Lonergan, B. J. (1985) Healing & creating in history. In F.E. Crow (Ed.) **A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard Lonergan.** Mawah, N.J.: Paulist Press.

Maryland State Department of Education (1989) **Maryland Student Service Alliance: The Courage to Care. The Strength to Serve; Draft Instructional Framework.** Baltimore: Md. State Dept. Ed.

Maslow, A.H. (1970) **Motivation and Personality (2nd Ed.).** N.Y.: Harper & Row.

Mecca, A.M., Smelsen, N.J., & Vasconcellos, J. (Eds.) (1989) **The Social Importance of Self-Esteem.** Berkeley: U. of Calif. Press.

Morrill, B. L. (1980) **Teaching Values in College.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sweet Home Central School District of Amherst & Tonawanda (1990) **Values In Education K-12: An Overview.** Amherst, N.Y.: Sweet Home Central School Dist.

Sweet Home Central School District of Amherst & Tonawanda (1990) **Values in Education K-12: A Practical Workshop for Elementary & Secondary Education.** Amherst, N.Y.: Sweet Home Central School Dist.

Townsend, K.K., O'Neill, M., & Allen, J. (1990) **Maryland Student Service Alliance, The Courage to Care. The Strength to Serve; Teacher Training Manual.** Baltimore: Md. State Dept. Ed.